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# Abstract

Building shared moral purpose is a sophisticated enterprise which requires leaders to navigate the complexities of modern schools in times which are ethically ambiguous. As Duignan (2003) found, the challenge for leaders is often to chose between two “goods” rather than a “good” and a “bad”. Educational leaders in complex times find themselves constantly engaged in discerning what the moral purpose of a community might be, and how best to bring it alive and nurture it in a way that will allow it to shape the educational experience.

This paper shares some of the findings of the *Leaders Transforming Learning and Learners* (LTLL) project (M. Bezzina, 2008b), a research project which seeks to give explicit attention to the ethical dimension of the work of educators in terms of the ways in which moral purpose is given expression in schools. It explores the meaning of moral purpose, and the consequences of taking it seriously. In particular, it focuses on how teachers see some of the moral dimensions of education being lived out in their schools, and the challenges with which this faces leaders.

More than just rhetoric: Putting moral purpose to work in complex times

# Introduction

Tim Hawkes, the Headmaster of one of Sydney’s most prestigious schools, Kings College, received considerable media attention when he confessed, in a full page article called *The Failure of Schools to Educate* (2008), that he had been “manifestly unfaithful as an educator” because he had been teaching an inadequate curriculum. His sentiment obviously touched a nerve within the community. His response to this realisation, however, seems to be limited to the production of a catalogue of “things our students will use as adults”.

At the same time, Australians are engaging, to greater or lesser degrees, in a debate about how to construct a national curriculum, which focuses on questions of the things that should be taught, the shape of the curriculum, and how to navigate the politics of state curricula in order to arrive at a workable national solution. The question of why these outcomes are worth pursuing is seldom raised (Bezzina, Starratt, & Burford, 2009).

The failure to expose the fundamental values – or moral purpose – of the educational enterprise to the same kind of scrutiny as the means by which it is realised creates an important gap in the discourse. Starratt (2007, p. 167) speaks of this in terms of a connection that is often missing in curriculum work, arguing that:

*educators miss this connection because they are accustomed to view the learning agenda of the school as an end in itself, rather than as a means for the moral and intellectual filling out of learners as human beings.*

In this missing connection lies the moral purpose of schools – elusive, and yet fundamental to the success of schools and the work of their leaders.

This paper shares some of the findings of a research project which seeks to give explicit attention to the ethical dimension of the work of educators in terms of the ways in which moral purpose is given expression in schools.

Building shared moral purpose is a sophisticated enterprise which requires leaders to navigate the complexities of modern schools in times which are ethically ambiguous. The challenge for leaders is often to chose between two “goods” rather than a “good” and a “bad” (Duignan, 2003). Educational leaders in complex times find themselves constantly engaged in discerning what the moral purpose of a community might be, and how best to bring it alive and nurture it in a way that will allow it to shape the educational experience.

This paper explores the meaning of moral purpose, and the consequences of taking it seriously. It reports some of the findings of the *Leaders Transforming Learning and Learners* (LTLL) project (Bezzina, 2008b) as a way of illustrating how moral purpose can be given expression in schools. In particular, it focuses on how teachers saw some of the moral dimensions of education being lived out in their schools.

# The meaning and significance of moral purpose

The fundamental challenge of curriculum making is an ethical one, whereby the curriculum should acknowledge the moral character of learning and create a structure within which the learning agenda of the school connects to the central moral agenda of the learners during their thirteen or more years in school - namely the agenda of finding and choosing and fashioning themselves as individuals and as a human community(Starratt, 2007). This challenge calls on each school to be clear and explicit about its moral purpose and to build consensus around it.

The notion of moral purpose has been labelled in many ways. MacBeath (2006)refers simply to ‘moral purpose’, but the National Quality Schooling Framework uses the label ‘shared whole school vision and goals’(Cuttance, 2003). IDEAS (Innovative Designs for Enhancing Achievements in Schools) uses ‘overarching values’ (Department of Education Training and the Arts Queensland, 2007). However described, shared moral purpose has been consistently identified as one of the fundamental necessities for bringing about the kind of change and improvement which will deliver desirable student learning in schools.

Moral purpose has many expressions, but almost all of them include the notion that such purpose be shared and/or pervasive. Rationally, a purpose which is not shared belongs to the individual rather than the organisation, and is unlikely to impact on overall performance. The National College of School Leadership (2006, p. 3) describes shared moral purpose as “a compelling idea or aspirational purpose, a shared belief [a team] can achieve far more for their end users together than they can alone”.

As the IDEAS project reminds us, there is a need for shared sense of purpose to be grounded in a shared commitment to explicit values (Andrews, 2004). In other words, it is not sufficient to have a broad aspiration. There needs to be clarity and detail in the way the purpose is understood – and in particular about the values which underpin it. It has been demonstrated that clear and explicit dialogue about these values has a mutually reinforcing relationship with the emergence of a sense of shared leadership(Bezzina, 2008b) .

Returning to the example from Tim Hawkes with which this paper opened, naming authentic learning as the goal of the work of schools assumes values and ethics whichoften go un-named and undiscussed. The challenge for educational leaders is to find ways to make these explicit - to give them expression and to promote ownership.

At the heart of shared moral purpose is the desire to make a difference. The most fundamental question for educators is this: “What should I do if I am to make a genuine difference in the lives of my students?” It can be argued that educators do this when they infuse academic learning with a dimension of personal meaning, and thereby enrich the whole learning process(Starratt, 2004). Authentic learning is more than taking new knowledge and skills for oneself. Authenticity is a far broader concept than relevance. It is about giving of one’s unique humanity to others and to the community. Authentic learning is a fundamentally moral activity because it engages students in a deeper understanding of the nature and purpose of their lives and in determining how they can best contribute to the greater good of the community and society (Hodgkinson, 1991). Learning which is not authentic to the needs of the student’s life is not only inappropriate but unethical. In other words, an educator who contributes to practices which are not authentic is engaging in behaviour which is morally wrong(Starratt, 2004). This challenge goes to the very heart of what educators do, and is the stimulus for the LTLL project which is described in the next section.

# The Leaders Transforming Learning and Learners project

The LTLL project aims to explore how leadership and learning practices based on a shared moral purpose might facilitate the work of teachers and leaders in enhancing student learning. It is an initiative which combines dimensions of professional development, school improvement and research, situated in a sample of Catholic schools in New South Wales, Australia. Its pilot phase (2005-2006) included nine primary and secondary schools from four systems, and the current phase (LTLL2) involves 13 primary and secondary schools from 6 systems.

The full project methodology is described elsewhere (Bezzina, 2008b). In brief, schools have been involved, with support from their systems and Australian Catholic University, in school based activities which would critically apply a values based conceptual framework.

The evolving conceptual framework which is at the heart of the LTLL initiative is an attempt to capitalise on the growing consensus in the literature around leadership and learning behaviours that have been shown to enhance student learning. This consensus extends to such issues as the importance of the quality of the teacher, primacy of assessment for learning, whole-school approaches to planning and implementation of curriculum, shared moral purpose, and the need to link leadership and learning (Bezzina, 2008b). The set of values and ethics which are central to the project were identified through workshops involving an expert group of school and system representatives which forms the steering group for the study.

The feedback from the pilot phase gave rise to the framework in Figure 1 below.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

In this framework the moral purpose is expressed in the values and ethics espoused by a school, and its sense of a transformed learner. This moral purpose influences the exercise of educational leadership and the approaches taken to authentic learning, and gives rise to a strong sense of teacher as leader (Bezzina, 2008a).

The elements of the framework are summarised below. In the second phase of the study (LTLL2), schools are working with these elements, and with a detailed set of features and indicators for each, as a basis for reflection.

# Elements of the LTLL conceptual framework

The elements of the framework are briefly described in the following sections.

### Values

Values shape behaviours, and thus are seen as foundational in this framework. If a school genuinely holds particular values, they should be visible in both the life and the rhetoric of the school. Different schools may choose to name different values as central to their activities. The LTLL model proposes five which were developed by senior system representatives, school personnel and ACU faculty involved in the study, as an expert group. The ones which were adopted were: Catholicity, justice, excellence, the common good and transformation. These reflect the nature of the research group, and their engagement in a particular school sector. This does not limit the capacity to learn from the experience of one group of schools’ attempts at greater explicitness in dealing with values. Different school communities and different systems would likely choose different names or sets of values. The critical issue is not the nature of the values, but that there is an explicit and owned value platform, and the consequences of working with them.

### Ethics

Ethics are the norms and virtues by which members of a community bind themselves to a moral way of living. They are the way in which values are lived out. Starratt (2004) suggests that they are maps that we consult only when the familiar terrain we are traversing becomes a tangle of underbrush. He names three particularly significant ethics, which were adopted for this study: authenticity (calling for integrity in interactions), presence (calling for relationships that are open and engaging), and responsibility (recognising personal and corporate accountability).

### The transformed learner

The values and ethics which form the basis of the model give rise to a particular set of aspirations for the learner. Transformed learners will take delight in both the subject and the process of learning, for which they take responsibility as part of a life-long journey. Their growing understanding reflects a rigorous, critical and respectful approach to the subject matter and to their fellow learners. They will be committed to their own growth – physical, intellectual, social and spiritual. Transformed learners will engage actively with society as engaged citizens seeking to make a difference. The values and ethics already named, and the vision of the transformed learner, give rise to particular approaches to leadership and learning.

The elements of educative leadership, authentic learning and teacher as leader are the vehicles by means of which the moral purpose is given expression.

### Educative Leadership

Educative leadership is understood as the capacity to influence others in order to enhance student learning. Research has identified a number of key features which distinguish good leadership, and those in this model embody the values and ethics already discussed. They are: leadership through collegiality, leadership based on evidence, leadership for professional learning, leadership for sustainability, leadership building culture and community, leadership for effective change, leadership through networking and leadership building capability.

### Authentic learning

Authentic learning is the very heart of the schooling enterprise. It is the most profound manifestation of the moral purpose which is captured in its vision of transformed learners. Research has identified a set of features that have been shown by studies such as that of Cuttance, Stokes et al., (2003) to impact positively on learning outcomes. These are represented in LTLL as standards for learning, organizing for learning, pedagogy, student engagement and assessment FOR and AS learning. In LTLL each of these is seen as a potential point of influence for the leader, and its implementation needs to be in accord with espoused values and ethics, using the types of leadership behaviours already identified.

### Teacher as leader

The quest to transform the learning of students challenges teachers to engage in leadership in new and more authentic ways. It is through the actions of teachers living out their values and ethics as educative leaders, and in the provision of authentic learning for students that this transformation will take place. Teachers as leaders have a clear and explicit understanding of the nature of the transformed learner. They are explicit about, and committed to the values and ethics underpinning the development of transformed learners. They are skilled in the creation of authentic learning experiences and are contributors to the educative leadership of the school.

The conceptual framework described above has informed – and been informed by – the implementation of both phases of the LTLL project. Given the significance of moral purpose, there is comparatively little research data about how teachers understand it, and how they see it operating in their schools. One of the objectives of the LTLL project has been to improve understanding of this aspect of leadership for learning. The next section reports on an analysis of the results of a self-reflection process used by schools in LTLL2, which tapped into their sense of where they stood with respect to key elements of the conceptual framework before commencing the program. The focus in this report is on the elements related to moral purpose.

# Schools’ self perceptions of elements of moral purpose

### Methodology

The LTLL2 sample comprises thirteen case study schools, six secondary and seven primary, drawn from six Catholic educational systems in NSW. The schools were nominated by their systems. Three of these systems are based in country cities and the other three are in metropolitan Sydney. Fifty teachers made up the thirteen project teams who were part of the study. The whole project was designed and managed collaboratively by representatives of the Australian Catholic University, the case study schools and the systems to which they belonged. The schools were the focus of analysis, and data for this element of the study were gathered through the use of a Reflection Guide built around the conceptual framework.

In this element of the LTLL2 research, each school team was asked during the first gathering of the participant school teams to use a Reflection Guide to rate their school’s performance on each feature of each element, using a three point “traffic light” scale (Red -not in evidence, Amber -unsure, Green - clearly in evidence), and to nominate the sources of evidence for their rating. The Reflection Guide was a refinement of the one used in the pilot (Bezzina, 2008b). A sample section (the Transformed Learner) from the Reflection Guide is included as Appendix 1. The complete Reflection Guide includes a similar section for each of the features of each element, with a description of that feature and a set of indicators of its presence. A listing of all the elements, features and indicators used in this analysis appears as Appendix 2. This paper draws on the elements of values ethics, and the transformed learner with their constituent features and indicators.

The process for completion of the Reflection Guide was that as each of the elements of the framework and its constituent features and indicators was explained by a presenter, school teams of three or four were given time to discuss and rate the extent to which they saw it as being evident in their school, and to name the evidence for their rating. Participants in the workshop appeared comfortable with the elements named, and with their interpretation. At the conclusion of the day, each school had developed a profile of their school’s current performance at the commencement of LTLL2. This was then used as a basis for deciding on the school’s improvement initiative, and constitutes a benchmark measure for each school. The same exercise will be completed at the conclusion of the LTLL2 intervention at the end of 2009.

### Results

Tables 1 to 3 below present the aggregated data for the relevant sections of the Reflection Guide. Eleven of the13 schools had completed and submitted the Reflection Guide at the time of analysis.

In each of these tables, each item is coded in column 1 in terms of the frequency with which schools rated their performance as not in evidence, unsure or clearly in evidence. Non response was included with unsure. Column 2 lists the differing forms of evidence identified for each item. (In some cases this was named as being present. In others it was named as being absent.) Column 3 reports the frequency with which each form of evidence was mentioned. The analysis in column 4 identifies whether each form of evidence focuses on an input (a policy or practice or quality of the school) or an outcome for students.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

#### Values

The collated responses from the Reflection Guide questions on values appear in Table 1. The value Catholicity, which was seen as being clearly in evidence by all except for one school, was excluded from this analysis due to its specialist nature.

Column 1 of Table 1 shows that for three of these four values, school teams most commonly indicated that there was no clear evidence of their presence. The exception was Common Good – being identified as clearly in evidence by nine of the respondent school teams. The low rate of “unsure” or non-response indicates that school teams felt confident in applying the values descriptors that had been given to them.

Six of the eleven respondent groups indicated that they did not see evidence of Excellence as a value in their schools. Shared values and explicit norms made up a significant proportion of the forms of evidence that respondents saw as significant, with collaboration and participative decision making and recognition of achievement also being identified. Among the indicators provided in the Reflection Guide, the embedding of best current understandings was not featured among responses. Surprisingly, perhaps, only one school actually named student outcomes as evidence for the presence of the value of Excellence in the school.

The value of Justice was seen as being clearly in evidence in only four of the respondent schools. Schools focused on their internal procedures and in the provision of particular programs in terms of evidence. Cultural dimensions included welcome and inclusion. Only two schools mentioned explicit attention to values. None identified the adoption of a public stance on issues of inequity or injustice. None of the forms of evidence focused on student behaviours as evidence for the attention to Justice in the schools.

The value of Transformation was identified as being in evidence by four schools. Curriculum was a focus of many of the forms of evidence cited. Meaningfulness and relevance were the most commonly named features, with an emphasis also on the range of offering and its differentiation. Among the four values under consideration here, this is the one for which student outcomes are most frequently cited as forms of evidence. Three of the nine forms of evidence were exam results, self responsibility and self knowledge, although their frequency of mention was low.

The Common Good was the value seen as most strongly in evidence, with nine schools rating it as evident. Every school which found evidence for this value, did so in terms of collaborative culture, and five of these named shared values and participative decision making. No school identified any student outcomes as evidence for their focus on the common good.

An examination of the focus of the evidence types cited by schools in their justification of ratings yields a strong and consistent bias among respondents to the use of inputs rather than student outcomes as evidence for their implementation of the values. Only four of the thirty types of evidence cited reflect an actual outcome for students. The remainder refer to programs, approaches, climate variables and the like – factors that are directly under the control of the school.

#### Ethics

The collated responses from the Reflection Guide questions on ethics appear in Table 2.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Six of the eleven schools indicated that they believed there was evidence of the ethic of Authenticity in their schools. Responses would seem to indicate that schools see themselves as being more successful in living out the interpersonal dimensions of this ethic - with trust, communication, sharing and reciprocity being named most frequently. Those forms of evidence related to learning most directly (authentic learning, challenge and standards, pastoral care and specific educational programs) are less frequently mentioned. Only authentic learning appears as a form of evidence which reflects outcomes for students.

The ethic of Presence yielded the highest number of non-responses or unsure responses of any of the elements in this report (four of eleven). This may reflect a lack of clarity about the concept itself, and will need to be explored further. Only two schools claimed that they had evidence of living out this ethic. Evidence for Presence was seen principally in the recognition of achievement, in openness and constructiveness of relationships and in the provision of opportunities for reflection. The remaining forms of evidence relate to a culture of inclusion. None of the forms of evidence related to student outcomes.

Consideration of the ethic of Responsibility by school groups resulted in a lower degree of consensus than for any of the other values or ethics, with only three being named by more than one school, and a maximum of four schools identifying any given form of evidence. Only three of the eleven schools rated their performance in this area positively. Accountability figured strongly among the forms of evidence – to shared values and to external authority. No student outcomes were identified as forms of evidence for Responsibility.

The pattern of responses for the ethics dimension of the conceptual framework is similar to that for values. The ethic of authenticity is the only one to receive a majority positive rating, and once again, the focus is on input variables rather than student outcomes.

The inter-related nature of the three ethics is reflected in the overlapping forms of evidence, in particular with their emphases on trust, communication and relationship.

#### Transformed Learner

The collated responses from the Reflection Guide questions on the Transformed Learner appear in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

Once more, schools have been critical of their own performance, with only three rating this element as being clearly in evidence in their school.

Table 3 reflects a significant shift in the forms of evidence being cited by school teams, with only one of the seven being an input. As the focus of this dimension of the framework being on the student, this is to be expected. Interestingly, despite a focus on pedagogy being cited most frequently as a form of evidence for this element of the framework, no school identified formal student academic/discipline-based learning outcomes as an indicator of the transformed learner.

# Synthesis and discussion

The results of this element of the LTLL2 study provide an insight into how schools understand their performance with respect to certain elements of moral purpose.

### Evidence for moral purpose

School responses to the Reflection Guide were diverse. With the exception of the value Common Good, the majority of schools indicated an inability to claim, on the basis of evidence, that aspects of moral purpose used in the study were present in their school. This finding might be understood in a number of ways.

The first is that the particular expressions of moral purpose identified in the framework used are not appropriate to the setting. Given their development by experts closely aligned with the schools, their use and subsequent refinement through the LTLL pilot, and the positive reception by participants in both the pilot and LTLL2, this would seem to be unlikely.

A second possible explanation is that the evidence for the presence of these elements of moral purpose does not, in fact, exist in these schools.

A third possibility is that respondents who were using the Reflection Guide and its underpinning concepts for the first time were overly harsh in their judgements.

A fourth possible explanation is that respondents lacked a well developed sense of how values, ethics and notions of the transformed learner might be seen in the routines of school life, and therefore underestimated the evidence available to them.

On the evidence available from this single administration of the Reflection Guide, it is impossible to identify which of these possible explanations, individually or in combination, best explains the ratings. However, the re-administration of the Reflection Guide after nearly two years of exposure to the conceptual framework, and explicit skilling in the gathering and use of evidence will provide an additional point of reference. Differences between the pre-and post-program ratings will be discussed with school teams to probe for underpinning explanations.

### Input and outcome focus

The system authorities who are part of the LTLL2 project explicitly identified a stronger focus on student outcomes as one of the developments they were looking for in this iteration of the program. The forms of evidence identified by respondents were classified as either school input focused or student outcome focused. The findings in this report indicate that student outcomes do not figure strongly among the forms of evidence to which schools habitually have recourse. The vast majority to emerge in responses were school input focused.

The data here reflects the schools’ perceptions prior to the commencement of the developmental element of the project. Tables 1 to 3 demonstrate that at the outset of the project, schools are placing a greater degree of emphasis on the evidence provided by actions the school takes (inputs) in terms of curriculum, pedagogy, policy and the like. This may be understandable in the context of the ethics which explicitly focus on the way values are lived out (Table 2). A similar case might be made for the values of Justice and the Common Good, but the absence of a stronger focus on forms of evidence drawn from student outcomes is less understandable in both Transformation and Excellence, where the very names of the values point to particular outcomes (Table 1). It is only in the context of the Transformed Learner element that there is a predominance of student outcome evidence, but even here, traditional notions of academic achievement are missing.

Hargreaves (1999) compares doctors and teachers in terms of their use of evidence, and argues that teachers make more use of what he calls “practical wisdom” and less of a knowledge base, which for doctors is cumulative, and for teachers, ought to be , but is not. This absence may help to explain some of the apparent anomalies in the evidence cited by LTLL2 participants.

### Common values and collaboration.

Common values and related concepts were named as a form of evidence in the values of Excellence, Justice and Common Good, and in the ethic of Responsibility. Notions of collaboration or shared leadership emerged as forms of evidence in Excellence and Common Good, and the ethics of Authenticity, Sharing and Presence. This supports the coexistence of commonly owned values and shared leadership which emerged as a key finding of the LTLL pilot, described by Bezzina (2008b).

The experience of the schools over the life of the pilot demonstrated that moral purpose can only be shared if it is understood (made explicit), if it becomes internalised by individuals, and if its internalisation is widespread – factors which are unlikely to come into play in the absence of the shared learning and ownership which were at the heart of shared leadership as experienced in the LTLL pilot schools. On the other hand, the development of shared leadership implies commonality of purpose, clarity of conceptualisation and a shared language – which feature strongly in the experience of shared moral purpose. There is a reciprocal influence taking place here.

# Conclusion

Educators, and in particular educational leaders, are charged with the responsibility of creating opportunities for authentic (not simply relevant) learning for their students. This is a fundamentally moral responsibility, as Hawkes(2008) reminded us in the introduction to this paper. Teachers seek to live out this responsibility as best they know how, but in the day to day running of schools the pressure is to adopt pragmatic approaches which work quickly and take for granted underlying values. This can translate into the championing of particular content, or specific curriculum structures, without first having clarified the purpose that such an approach might serve.

The limited degree to which schools at the commencement of LTLL2 were able to identify evidence for aspects of fundamental purpose raises questions about how teachers understand that purpose, how it is expressed in the life of the school, and what they understand to be evidence of its expression. For leaders seeking to work with moral purpose in their schools, this provides significant challenges. At the same time, the finding provides a solid rationale for a program such as LTLL, which engages schools in evidence based enquiry in their own schools with a focus on greater explicitness about moral purpose, and which consciously seeks to share new learning across a group of schools and their systems. This will add to their own local knowledge base, and then to that of their partner schools, and ultimately, it is hoped, to that of the profession at large.
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**APPENDIX 1: SECTION FROM LTLL2 REFLECTION GUIDE**

Extract from introduction

We will use this Reflection Guide as an aid to learning in our orientation session. After discussing each of the elements, you will be asked to rate it using the traffic lights and to provide some evidence for your view. The traffic lights are used as follows:

Not in evidence

Unsure if present

Clearly in evidence

Transformed learner section.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Rating | Evidence |
| ***Focus 1: The transformed learner***  In our commitment to authentic learning, based on our values and ethics in action, we promote authentic learning with the hope that our students will become transformed by their experience in a Catholic school into fuller, richer, deeper human beings.  . They will be:   * excited by learning * self aware * committed to life long learning * intellectually curious * knowledgeable in different disciplines and able to make connections among them * critical and creative thinkers and problem solvers * pro-social, empathic and respectful of others * autonomous, capable, optimistic and resilient * engaged citizens committed to making a difference in the world * committed to their ongoing spiritual growth |  |  |

Appendix 2: ***Leaders Transforming Learning and Learners :Features and Indicators***

***Element 1: The transformed learner***

* excited by learning
* self aware
* committed to lifelong learning
* intellectually curious
* knowledgeable in different disciplines and able to make connections among them
* critical and creative thinkers and problem solvers
* pro-social, empathic and respectful of others
* autonomous, capable, optimistic and resilient
* engaged citizens committed to making a difference in the world
* committed to their ongoing spiritual growth

***Element 2: Teacher as Leader***

* have a clear and explicit understanding of the nature of the transformed learner
* be explicit about, and committed to the values and ethics underpinning the development of transformed learners
* be skilled in the creation of authentic learning experiences
* be active contributors to the educative leadership of the school

***Element 3: Values***

*Catholicity*

* Makes the teachings of the Church explicit
* Expresses a spirit of hope, mutual regard and forgiveness
* Promotes an active prayer life
* Builds strong partnerships with parish
* Delivers a quality Religious Education program
* Makes Gospel values explicit and evident in all its activities

*Excellence*

* Shares an explicit view of what constitutes good teaching and learning
* Has high expectations of students and teachers
* Embeds best current understandings of teaching and learning in practice
* Caters for individual differences
* Celebrates a whole range of achievement within the community
* Expects and supports continuous staff professional development
* Builds collaborative cultures of practice
* Expects that students are able to articulate values and live them out

*Justice*

* Embraces the diversity of people and cultures
* Actively seeks to serve the poor and marginalised
* Tailors its policies and procedures to give priority to the poor and least powerful
* Is prepared to take a public stance on issues of inequity or injustice
* Embodies the principles of justice in its teaching

*Transformation*

* Ensure that learning is relevant to students’ lives
* Provide experiences that are meaningful and purposeful
* Promote self knowledge in learners
* Empower students to be active in society
* Challenge students to take responsibility for their own learning
* Challenge students to live out their values

*The Common Good*

* Builds community around shared norms
* Places great value on relationships
* Promotes collaborative practice in teaching and learning
* Ensures that decisions making involves those most likely to be affected by the outcomes
* Distributes resources equitably
* Ensures stability and safety for all

***Element 4: Ethics***

*Authenticity*

* Requires truth and integrity in all its members
* Demonstrates reciprocity in interpersonal relationships
* Promotes authentic learning
* Challenges staff and students to engage with society in ways that promote authenticity
* Develops school and class structures that nurture authenticity

*Presence*

* Encourages insightful self reflection and self awareness
* Promotes sensitivity to others
* Values relationships which increase engagement within the school community
* Affirms and supports students and staff in their achievement
* Demonstrates clear communication and empathic listening

*Responsibility*

* Takes responsibility for the learning outcomes of all students
* Builds a culture of shared accountability for the core values of the school
* Promotes habits of self-responsibility among students
* Creates a healthy organisational environment
* Promotes the pursuit of virtue in the community

***Element 5: Educative Leadership***

*Leadership through collegiality*

* Is committed to genuinely collegial leadership
* Has an explicit and owned sense of the educational purpose in the school.
* Shares an explicit view of what constitutes good teaching and learning
* Promotes a sense of staff efficacy and competence Empowers all staff to make decisions which are in tune with the school’s common educational purpose.
* Holds staff accountable for exercising initiative in accord with the school’s mission.
* Has agreed common standards for performance
* Engages in collaborative professional learning
* Promotes teacher initiative and innovative practice in the pursuit of transformed learning.

*Leadership based on evidence*

* Names the key forms of evidence which are necessary for decision making
* Requires the use of evidence as the basis for decision making
* Has procedures for the routine collection of relevant evidence
* Has procedures for interpreting data
* Acts on the basis of feedback on performance
* Skills teachers in evidence-based practice.

*Leadership for professional learning*

* Places a high value on ongoing teacher professional development
* Supports team-based learning through school structures and procedures
* Encourages professional conversation based on experience and the best available literature and research
* Encourages innovation with appropriate use of evidence on impact
* Makes professional learning a focus for appraisal and professional dialogue

*Leadership for Sustainability*

* Makes conscious provision for leadership sustainability
* Supports those in leadership roles
* Supports and encourages many people to take on leadership
* Allocates the necessary resources to leadership
* Seeks diversity in leadership
* Promotes critical and activist leadership
* Builds links beyond the school

*Leadership building Culture and Community*

* Has an explicit and owned sense of purpose in the school, grounded in its Catholic identity.
* Uses clear, shared language to describe vision and core activities
* Has an accepted and lived set of norms for professional behaviour
* Celebrates key events and achievements as a community
* Lives out core values in behaviour, word, ritual and symbol
* Promotes collaborative learning and practice.

*Leadership for effective change*

* Drives change out of moral purpose
* Engages in the process of change all those affected by it
* Facilitates change in the context of community and relationships
* Develops procedures to ensure sharing of knowledge within the school community
* Builds coherence through alignment of values and practices
* Embodies enthusiasm, hope and energy in the leadership of change.
* Embeds innovative practice in curriculum

*Leadership through networking*

* Works in close partnership with parents, focussing on two way communication about the individual needs of students.
* Engages actively with parish(es) as a key element of its pastoral work
* Develops networks with other schools within and beyond the system
* Engages actively with other education providers in targeted programs
* Encourages staff membership of professional associations

*Leadership building capability*

* Appreciates the complexity of leadership capability
* Recognises the capabilities it has in its people
* Provides opportunities for the formation of all staff to develop capabilities
* Builds a climate of trust, mutual support and development.

***Element 6: Authentic Learning***

# *Standards for learning*

## Expects high standards – based on syllabus outcomes and indicators

* Challenges students in all areas of their development

## Develops standards that are clear and known by staff, students and parents

## Provides for individual differences through curriculum differentiation

## Organises the program within and across stages

## Develops a curriculum for authentic learning experiences

## Develops a curriculum which reflects Catholic values

# *Organising for learning*

## Allocates resources with a priority on learning

## Makes the most of the time available for learning (How much and when)

* Optimises the use of space to enhance learning outcomes
* Uses technology to support teaching and learning

## Uses a variety of groupings reflecting differing ability/interest

## Allows students to feel safe and secure

## Ensures there is equity in the allocation of resources

# *Pedagogy*

## Is welcoming and inclusive of all students, with particular concern for those with the greatest needs.

## Caters for student differences.

## Uses a variety of teaching strategies

## Makes the most of learning time

## Understands learning as a relational activity

## Allows for many kinds of interaction

## Makes use of different contexts for learning (in and out of school)

## Provides targeted intervention programs for students with special educational needs

## Reviews constantly, using evidence for improvement

# *Student engagement*

## Is explicitly focused on goals

## Seeks to make learning relevant to the lives of students

## Builds new learning on previous understanding

## Seeks to extend knowledge, skills and attitudes

## Develops self knowledge and self-management

## Promotes student self-responsibility and initiative

## Goes beyond mere facts

## Promotes student decision-making

## Enables transfer to new situations.

# *Assessment FOR and AS learning*

## Promotes assessment FOR learning and AS learning (not just OF learning)

## Bases assessment on curriculum

## Matches performance against standards

## Provides regular, clear and meaningful feedback to students and parents

## Values teachers’ professional judgments

## Uses assessment data to shape teaching and learning.

Figure 1: The LTLL Conceptual framework



Table 1: Forms of evidence for Values

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Value | Evidence | Frequency | Focus\*\* |
| *Excellence* |  |  |  |
|  | High Expectations/Shared values | 8 | I |
|  | Collaborative practice | 5 | I |
| Clearly 3 | Recognition, celebration and reward | 4 | I |
| Not 6 | Professional development | 4 | I |
| Unsure/NR 2 | Explicit norms | 4 | I |
|  | Participative decision-making | 2 | I |
|  | External examination results | 1 | O |
|  | A particular educational initiative | 1 | I |
|  | Trust | 1 | I |
| *Justice* |  |  |  |
|  | Internal policies and procedures that are just | 7 | I |
| Clearly 4 | Special education programs | 7 | I |
| Not 7 | A focus on outreach and social justice programs | 5 | I |
| Unsure/NR 0 | A culture of welcome and inclusion | 5 | I |
|  | Explicit attention to values | 2 | I |
| *Transformation* |  |  |  |
|  | Meaningful/relevant learning experiences | 6 | I |
| Clearly 4 | An expansive curriculum | 5 | I |
| Not 6 | Culture of challenge and expectation | 3 | I |
| Unsure/NR 1 | External examination results | 2 | O |
|  | Metacognitive approach | 1 | I |
|  | Differentiated curriculum | 2 | I |
|  | Student self responsibility | 1 | O |
|  | Student self knowledge | 1 | O |
|  | Gifted and talented program | 1 | I |
| *Common good* |  |  |  |
|  | Culture of collaboration | 9 | I |
| Clearly 9 | Shared values | 5 | I |
| Not 2 | Participative decision making | 4 | I |
| Unsure/NR 0 | Equitable distribution of resources | 3 | I |
|  | Pastoral care program | 3 | I |
|  | Climate open to criticism | 2 | I |
|  | Special needs program |  | I |

\*\* I= School input focus

O=Student outcome focus

Table 2: Forms of evidence for Ethics

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ethic | Evidence | Frequency | Focus\*\* |
| *Authenticity* |  |  |  |
|  | Trust and open communication | 5 | I |
| Clearly 6 | Reciprocity and personal sharing | 4 | I |
| Not 3 | Authentic learning | 2 | O |
| Unsure/NR 2 | Challenge and standards | 2 | I |
|  | Specific educational programs | 2 | I |
|  | Pastoral care | 2 | I |
|  | Engaged staff | 1 | I |
| *Presence* |  |  |  |
|  | Celebrate achievement | 7 | I |
| Clearly 2 | Open and constructive communication and relationship | 6 | I |
| Not 5 | Opportunity for reflection | 5 | I |
| Unsure/NR 4 | Pastoral care | 2 | I |
|  | “Open door” approach | 2 | I |
|  | Participative decision making | 1 | I |
|  | Positive meeting style | 1 | I |
| *Responsibility* |  |  |  |
|  | Accountability to shared values | 4 | I |
| Clearly 3 | External accountabilities | 3 | I |
| Not 6 | Sound organisational practice | 2 | I |
| Unsure/NR 2 | Self responsibility among staff | 1 | I |
|  | Curriculum differentiation | 1 | I |
|  | Just resource allocation | 1 | I |
|  | Effective communication | 1 | I |

\*\* I= Input focus

O=Student outcome focus

Table 3: Forms of evidence for Transformed Learner

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Transformed learner | Evidence | Frequency | Focus\*\* |
|  | Focus on pedagogy | 5 | I |
|  | Students live out hoped for attitudes | 4 | O |
| Clearly 3 | Student engagement with/commitment to learning | 4 | O |
| Not 5 | Student commitment to social justice | 4 | O |
| Unsure/NR 3 | Signs of spiritual growth in students | 3 | O |
|  | Students are critical and creative thinkers | 2 | O |
|  | Curiosity of students | 2 | O |

\*\* I= Input focus

O=Student outcome focus